DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 099 698 CG 009 125

AUTHOR Appley, Dee G.
TITLE Two Person Careers and Two Career Persons: Towards Increased Options for All.
PUB DATE Aug 73
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the World Congress of the International Association for Education and Vocational Education (5th, Quebec, Canada, August 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Discriminatory Attitudes (Social); Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Feminism; Occupational Choice; *Sex Stereotypes; *Social Attitudes; Speeches; Vocational Interests

ABSTRACT

This presentation suggests that creating more options for all individuals is a way to move away from alienation toward liberation, and attempts to clarify this change process by looking at some of the forces which stand in the way of increasing options. It deals largely with the issue of limitations imposed on individuals by virtue of their sexuality. The author maintains that rather than recognizing the duality of human existence wherein both sexes have what are called masculine and feminine impulses, we have forced each sex to specialize and cultivate only one set of characteristics and deny the other. This makes for alienation within the individual and polarizes the sexes, making communication between them more difficult. The author concludes that it will require active efforts to effect attitude changes that lead to cooperation between women and men, and among people, to overcome the barriers that have for so long existed. (Author/HMV)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 099698

CG 009 125

TWO PERSON CAREERS AND TWO CAREER PERSONS:

TOWARDS INCREASED OPTIONS FOR ALL

DEE G. APPLEY, Ph.D.
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Mass. 01002, U/S.A.

I would like to develop a theme to speak to the title of the Congress: Work and the Individual: Alienation or Liberation, with particular emphasis on the psychological factors in the choice of a career. I will suggest that creating more options for all individuals is a way to move away from alienation towards liberation, and I would like to try to clarify the dynamics of this change process by looking at some of the forces which stand in the way of increasing options, and some of the currents which suggest that the status quo can, and indeed must, give way.

I realize that there are many problems that have psychological consequences in the choice of a career, and I am reluctant to be seeming to ignore such important issues as the restrictions put on people by virtue of religion, race, nationality, age and all the other ways that societies have for putting people down. I trust that some of these issues will come up here later, and some will be dealt with by others also. I will deal largely with the issue of limitations imposed on individuals by virtue of the sexual apparatus with which they are born. This is, of course, a universal situation, and involves two groups of people - of about equal numbers - who have, in most societies developed, over time, an hierarchical relationship with deeply ingrained psychological consequences for both. This is true, of course, for all stereotyping and imposed restrictions there are serious psychological consequences for all.

Presented in Quebec at Laval University on August 22, 1973 at the Fifth World Congress of the International Assoc. for Educ.andVoc. Educ.

The title of my paper is purposely cryptic and indeed contains many possibilities for understanding how work and the individual have been and can be related. In order to emphasize the limits and negative sanctions put on individuals, I have said that I would speak of various options for men and women to combine work and marriage. This forces us to deal from the start with the fact that, although the options for both men and women have been limited, the options for women are drastically more limited. However, since a man and a woman in a marriage are a system, changing any part of that system must inevitably lead to changes in the whole system, and must deal with the resistances to change which are often set off in the second person. And since any two-person relationship is also part of a larger, societal system and has some effect on the total system, we will need to examine the resistances from the larger system to any change in its subsystems.

In other words, we shall have to deal with individual, interpersonal and societal questions if we are to understand how to increase for the individual opportunities for liberation and decrease the problem of alienation. I am assuming, of course, that we are agreed that liberation is the preferred mode of existence and that the quality of our lives would be enhanced by such a development.

For a long time now, the most important decision a man can make has been the life work he will choose; for a woman, what man's offer of marriage she will accept. For a man, his work takes him out of the home; for a woman, her work is in the home. Taking care of the house and the children are considered the most important concerns of any woman, no matter what her talents, inclinations, or

education. Men are supposed to be rational, competitive, aggressive and successful in their work. Women are supposed to be emotional, passive, dependent, and nurturant. Thus normally it takes two adults to maintain one career - the man's. And it is required that the man maintain his private family, and provide for all their material needs. This is the standard version of the two-person career. If the wife works - and as a matter of fact many women do work, most because they have to, financially - her work outside the home is always considered secondary to her responsibilities in the home. Even in professional dual career families, the 2-career persons, it is almost invariably the woman who is responsible for making the provisions that make it possible for her to leave the house: hire a housekeeper, find a substitute if a sitter or housekeeper does not show up, be responsible for maintaining the ongoing maintenance functions of a family: birthdays, etc.

It is taken for granted that women, by nature, are better able to perform the menial and nonrewarding chores that are required in our lives. Particularly in a country like the United States, it is assumed that children must have their natural mother with them all of the time, and anything less than that leads to feelings of guilt for the mother should anything go wrong, now or in the future.

Thus the myths that keep women in their homes make them live vicariously thru their husbands, and their children. And the woman/wife/mother becomes the guardian of the emotional life of the family. This both limits her development and makes her very powerful. She can give or withhold that part of the resources of others that makes life meaningful and human. Men, on the other hand, give up

that part of themselves and accept that it is the woman's role to supply expressive behavior, their role to supply instrumental behavior as the sociologist Talcott Parsons has described it. Or, as Chodorow has said: woman's life is being, men's doing.

Thus both men and women are alienated from a part of themselves. Rather than recognizing the duality of human existence, that both sexes have what are called masculine and feminine impulses (that is that both can be intelligent and emotional, competitive and collaborative, aggressive and nurturant, autonomous and dependent, active and passive), we have forced each sex to specialize and cultivate only one set of characteristics and deny the other. This makes for alienation within the individual, and polarizes the sexes making communication between them more difficult.

We have come to think that the way things are is a function of human nature, that this is the way things must be. But a look at history would help rid us of this misconception. Recently, more and more information if finding its way into print to remind us and inform us that much of our understanding about the sexes is based on myths, not facts.

There is increasingly available both speculation and evidence that up until five to eight thousand years ago, women were 'the first sex', that matriarchy rather than patriarchy was the rule. This early society was classless, there was communal ownership of production, there was no coercive state apparatus, and the family was not the basic unit but rather the tribe and the clan. Sexually, women were free as were men, and children were cared for by all, not

owned by their parents. As Bachofen tells us, the child bearing function was the source of power, and, as Briffault says, they were producers of goods as well. All activities but hunting and warring were carried on by women. No woman was dependent on one man; no child on one mother or father.

Then 6-8 thousand years ago this began to break down, and we have moved from tribal communes to separate clans to extended families (as on old time farms) to the nuclear family, the family as we know it which dates only from about the late 17th century. Thus, with the accumulation of surplus wealth, patriarchal values developed to insure that wealth stayed 'in the family' which required also monogamous marriages so that the father could be sure of the paternity of his children. Women went from producer to dependent. Law and religion made it a natural obligation and duty for the individual man to support his family.

With the industrial revolution came the further separation of house and work: men went out to work, women stayed home to keep house, and the nuclear family developed its hold on the breadwinner to support this unit. So communal membership and communal care of children were left behind with matriarchal values, and so was the family as a self-contained unit. Now production and consumption were separated, and the work that women did came to be seen as not valuable because it had no monetary value. And pater families owned his wife along with his children and slaves.

In any case, it came to be that, particularly in industrialized society, the man was the breadwinner, and the woman the keeper of the house and children. Marriage and child bearing and child rearing

became woman's full time work; running the world became man's work. Specialization of work and function became increasingly exaggerated.

As Roszak and Roszak say: (pp vii and viii)

"He is playing masculine. She is playing feminine.

He is playing masculine <u>because</u> she is playing feminine. She is playing feminine <u>because</u> he is playing masculine.

He is playing the kind of man that she thinks the kind of woman she is playing ought toadmire. She is playing the kind of woman that he thinks the kind of man he is playing ought to desire.

If he were not playing masculine, he might well be more feminine than she is - except when she is playing very feminine. If she were not playing feminine, she might well be more masculine than he is - except when he is playing very masculine.

So he plays harder. And she plays...softer.

He wants to make sure that she could never be more masculine than he. She wants to make sure that he could never be more feminine than she. He therefore seeks to destroy the femininity in himself. She therefore seeks to destroy the masculinity in herself.

She is supposed to admire him for the masculinity in him that she fears in herself. He is supposed to desire her for the femininity in her that he despises in himself.

He desires her for her femininity which is his femininity, but which he can never lay claim to. Since he may only love his own femininity in her, he envies her femininity. She admires him for his masculinity which is <u>her</u> masculinity, but which she may never lay claim to. Since she may only love her own masculinity in him, she envies him his masculinity.

The envy poisons their love.

He, coveting her unattainable femininity, decides to punish her. She coveting his unattainable masculinity, decides to punish him. He denigrates her femininity - which he is supposed to desire and which he really envies - and becomes more aggressively masculine. She feigns disgust at his masculinity - which she is supposed to admire and which she really envies - and becomes more fastidiously feminine. He is becoming less and less what he wants to be. She is becoming less and less what she want to be. But now he is more manly than ever, and she is more womanly than ever.

Her femininity, growing more dependently supine, becomes contemptible. His masculinity, growing more oppressively domineering, becomes intolerable. At last she loathes what she has helped his masculinity to become. At last he loathes what he has helped her femininity to become.

So far, it has all been very symmetrical. But we have left one thing out.

The world belongs to what his masculinity has become.

The reward for what his masculinity has become is power. The reward for what her femininity has become is only the security which his power can bestow upon her. If he were to yield to what her

femininity has become, he would be yielding to contemptible incompetence. If she were to acquire what his masculinity has become, she would participate in intolerable coerciveness.

She is stifling under the triviality of her femininity. The world is groaning beneath the terrors of his masculinity.

He is playing masculine. She is playing feminine.

How do we call off the game?"

The changes that are needed cannot be brought about by individuals; there must be societal sanctions and supports. The most glaring fact that we must deal with now is the problem of sexual stereotyping, i.e. the most important determinant of what an individual will learn, can become, and will be circumscribed by is the presence or absence of a penis or a womb, and what that signifies psychologically in terms of options and negative sanctions. For the one possessing the womb, getting married and having children represent the prescribed accomplishments; passivity and dependence, the accepted psychological characteristics. For the one possessing the penis, the requirements are finding an occupation, and being achievement oriented and aggressive. The psychological implications of this accidental fact of birth takes precedence over all other characteristics of the individual.

I will talk first about the United States, with which I am most familiar from personal experience; and then expand that by utilizing the work of other researchers. Every day, children are socialized by their parents, by their schools, by the media, through the books they read -- by all the socialization agents that have a stake in keeping people in their places by gender. Instead of recognizing the duality of human existence, and utilizing both one's masculine and one's feminine impulses - (according to Bakan these tendencies are calledy 'agency' and 'communion'; the one, a tendency to overcome, the other a tendency to join with) - instead, we have channeled people into sex role behaviors, accomplishments, and lives. Thus most individuals are alienated from themselves: women from their assertive, intellectual, rational, competitive, striving selves; men from their emotional, caring for others, acknowledging dependency, collabora-

tive feminine selves. Instead of a dialectic, there is polarization, both within the self and between the self and the other. From the moment of birth, we begin to handle boys and girls differently: smile at one, bounce theother; dress one in pink and the other in blue to be sure that they are responded to properly by others, etc. The end result is 2 categories of people: both accepting limitations; but for one, the seeming rewards are more striking.

We go on to develop elaborate social science theories to explain the status quo such as Parson's theory of instrumental and expressive behavior being representative of males and females, and Freud's theory of sexuality. But it would appear that society invents the kind of human nature it needs for its purposes as social learning theorists and others are beginning to demonstrate. If maleness and femaleness are so natural, why are there so many sanctions to insure conformity?

We must acknowledge that social scientists, like other human beings, exist in the context of their societies, and many so-called theoretical explanations are based on limited perspective, not on facts. Up until very recently, the kind of research that would begin to give us the answers we need has not been done. For now, it seems abundantly clear that people are shaped by their cultures to be whatever the culture needs. Thus in time of war and labor shortages, women are seen as able to work at many kinds of jobs, and day-care centers, wage incentives, and other supports are provided. When they are not needed, they are encouraged and indeed forced to return to their homes to do their womanly, anatomy-is-destiny jobs.

The title of this paper was purposely ambiguous because there are many ways that any two individuals have worked out their work and marriage relationship, that two people can agree on an arrangement that is more or less satisfactory to both. But for most people, these arrangements are not choices; they are prescribed and accepted however unwillingly.

Are men going to have to meet these standards? Are women going to remain 'the second sex'? Or is it no longer necessary to accept certain assumptions about men and women, and their separate spheres so that there can be individual choice rather than conformity to patterns of behavior that are taken as givens. It is my suggestion that individuals must be freed from the restrictions of socialization which limit their options unnecessarily: limitations based on myth, on convenience, on fear, on social pressure and expectation. Is the division of labor based on biology as Freud, the church, Madison Avenue and the media have been telling us, or is it based on mythology; and is it a form of oppression that, like all oppression, must be seen as politioal and deal with as such.

Surely if it were a matter of being natural that men went out to work and women stayed at home, there would scarcely need to be so many rules and regulations to ensure that this would happen. Father it has been convenient, after a certain point in history, to set people up in their single unit families dependent on the man's earnings, and the man in turn dependent on the woman's emotional nurturance. The man's career choice is often left up to his talents and his training; the woman's is determined for her when she is born. He is destined to work; she is destined to bear children and keep house.

But some men and some women have begun to recognize that this is not a law of nature, but a rule of man. And they have begun to make changes in their life styles. Some men have begun to recognize that they enjoy being nurturant, and caring, and thoughtful of others, up until now considered the sphere of women; and some women have begun to recognize that they are persistent, and strong, and have ideas they would like to deal with in the real world outside the house, and they are finding ways to do that without having to consider themselves abnormal, masculine or sick.

In other words, we are beginning to see that the sexism and sexual stereotyping, not nature, have set the rules by which people are living unhappily, and these things are beginning to be challenged.

I think we can be too easily misled by the exceptions - by the few men and women who are making it without conforming. The price is very high for both the individual exceptions,and for the societythat places the restrictions. Always some members of a minority group, even a caste, have been able to make it in a system that excludes most of their members. This does not make the system acceptable, and indeed it is not obviously meeting the needs of many people. Signs that the system is not working include the abuse of drugs and alcohol, the rising rate of divorce, the many kinds of drop-outs and countercultures, runaway children, mental illness, the dissatisfaction of large numbers of workers, and so forth: all signs of alienation.

In addition, not too long ago the life span was shorter, many children who were born did not reach adulthood, and many more people had to work long hours just to make a survival

living. Now the need to limit population, and the fact that people live longer and do not have to work such long hours, all combine to mean that women no longer can be asked to commit their lives to raising children. And since most paid work does not any longer provide a sense of self=worth that it was supposed to, men also are beginning to question their options, the restrictions and expectations placed on them. Indeed many dropouts from the system are successful men between the ages of 35 and 45.

For men, the paid labor force has been dropping somewhat; for women, it has been rising somewhat; but for neither has there been increased satisfaction. A task force report to HEW tells us that work should not damage or degrade; should interest and satisfy, should use many skills and provide a chance to learn new skills, should enhance other life roles such as parenthood, and should provide goods and services. This is certainly not true for many jobs or even careers. Both want more options and more satisfaction.

Women are tired of being asked why they want a career; men would like to be asked why they want a career. Given the variety of ways that work could be a part of one's life, there are many variations on the theme of my title IF psychological barriers can be taken away, and social supports provided. So a 2-person career can mean - as it often does now - one person in paid employment, the other at home. <u>But</u> it could mean the woman going out to work, the man staying home. Or it could mean alternating over a period of years. Or it could be 2 people sharing one job, with all the benefits of a full time job and only half the work for each.

As for two career persons: it can mean dual career fami-

lies with true sharing at home. Or it can mean that individuals, both men and women, will have 2 or more careers in a lifetime: just as now men retire early from business or the military and turn to a service profession; just as women go back to work after spending 10 or more years at home with the children. Others could have a series of careers.

But the combinations are much greater than that: we need to recognize that, for different individuals, work can mean different things at different stages of life. So we need more flexibility, and we need to think of a lifetime as containing cycles of work-leisure-education. The rigidity of our traditional expectations must go.

All of this means changing our attitudes from <u>should</u> or <u>must</u> to <u>would like to</u> or <u>can</u>. Difference in choices would be encouraged, not punished. What fantasy do <u>you</u> have about what you would like to be doing 5 years from now? What is standing in your way: your own feelings? your spouse? society? What permissions do you need??

Obviously there are societal structures which must support social changes, and at the same time, people meeting together need to raise their consciousness and dare to change without feeling they will be condemned, chastised, punished, considered ill, insane, or irresponsible. This is the way to liberation; to put off these societal and group supports can only lead to further frustration and alienation. Even with support it will be difficult to overcome the attitudes we acquire even before we can speak: e.g. that mothers are soft and warm and always there; that fathers take care of us and protect us from the outside world. Truly terror strikes at many as these myths are challenged. Who will take care of the children, who will provide emotional support for the father, who will provide the money and the protection???

Most social controls are informal. The messages however are very clear: To women: be feminine; be a mother; do not think, do not lead. To men: be a man; be strong; be brave; be responsible; work. In many places both are urged to marry. For the woman, this means further restrictions about what she can do. Even if she does go to work, she must choose from limited 'feminine' occupations, and limited rewards. Even in Sweden, where many social supports are provided, still there are 'women's' occupations; and'men's' occupations. An oft-cited statistic that in Russia 4 out of 5 physicians are women is misleading: of the prestigious positions among physicians, 4 out of 5 are men!

We can classify societies by the range of options offered to both sexes, and look to see whether there are child care facilities, paid maternity leaves, tax benefits for 2 career families, alternative modes for hours of work,level and type of promotions, no differentiation between masculine and feminine occupations, etc. We can also classify families according to how non-sex-role-related the functions are, and the range of options offered and allowed, without regard to sex, for the children as well as the parents. We will find then that there can be societal support with or without family support; and there can be family support with or without societal support for non-sex-role-related choices. Real liberation would mean no imposed sex-role requirements.

These social controls are so strong and so subtle that, even when there are societal and family sanctions, and even when women can enter 'masculine' occupations, they choose to special-

ize in the less prestigious areas of a profession, and hardly ever reach the top levels. It is a vicious cycle: women have a lower level of aspiration, there is a poor support system, their level of aspiration is lowered further,etc. And even if they escape this first set of socialization barriers, they get the boring jobs or the most tedious tasks in the professions.

I am sure we could brainstorm here today to find ways to meet the problems that would be raised if we could imagine all people having all options. But of course we cannot know all the possibilities; we cannot foretell the synergistic and serendipitous benefits - i.e. the changes brought about by change.

The biggest psychological problem to overcome is the belief that women are weak, passive, dependent, accomodating, and born to be mothers. And the belief that men are strong, aggressive, independent, competitive and born to be breadwinners. For women, we must overcome the fear of success; for the men, fear of failure. We know how to do many of the things that would make a difference: we know that if children get independence training and mastery thinking, they learn to think analytically. We know that differential treatment by the father is especially important in the way boys and girls differ and that often, if we find achievement oriented women, they had encouraging fathers. We know that boys learn to mold the world; and girls to be molded by it. We know that in psychological testing, individual differences are greater than sex differences.

So, besides getting over these restricting attitudes about males and females, we must also recognize that there are other acceptable personal life styles besides the 2-person marriage, with children, living in a single household, and respon-

sible presumably for all of its own problems.

It will require legal changes as well so that women are recognized as individuals in their own right; so that tax benefits can be given; so that new style communal families can live together, and so forth.

Well, shall we catch our breath and see where to go from here. We have seen that there are psychological barriers to free choice of careers, and societal barriers. We have seen that this is not a law of human nature, but of man-made nature. And we have seen that there are both resistances to change, and dissatisfactions which presage change. Now I would like to take us one step further.

Having looked at some of the barriers to free choice that have been put on people, what can we say about the future of work if these barriers were to be overcome? Fred Best has edited a book by that name which is an exciting collection of ideas by various individuals who deal with such provocative thoughts as the meaning of work throughout history, an emerging synthesis of work and education, the idea of guaranteed income so that we can move towards post-economic motivation, and the future meanings of work.

As we have seen before, we ought to expect and plan for diversity. We cannot of course foresee major dramatic breakthroughs, but at least for now we can still think of work as a part of the life of an individual, and define it as goal-oriented human activity. Historically work has moved from a drudgery to a calling, and for economic man, an end in itself. Now Herman Kahn and Anthony Wiener tell us that we may look for-

ward to a range of attitudes towards work with different basic values to be fulfilled by work: (p. 152)

Basic attitude toward work as:	Basic additional value fulfilled by work ;
1. interruption	short run income
2. job	long term income; some work-oriented values (one works to live)
3. occupation	exercise and mastery of gratifying skills-some satisfaction of achievement oriented values
4. career	participating in an important activity or program; much satisfaction of work-oriented, achievement-oriented values
5. vocation (calling)	self-identification and self-fulfillment
6. mission	near fanatic or single-minded focus on achievement or advancement (one lives to work)

They conclude that it will probably be difficult to get people to do demanding work that requires long and arduous training, or working under difficult, dangerous and frustrating conditions although cutting the hours of work down drastically (e.g. a 4-hour work day) may make up for this. Still they predict that "Yet, at the same time, skilled, personal services requiring irreducible quantities of human time, training, and talent would become both absolutely and relatively expensive. Thus there would probably still be a very strong demand for, and probably also a much expanded supply of expensive and skilled professionals, managers, entrepreneurs, artisans, technicians and artists-for the most part, the well-educated upper middle class. This group may well be much too busy and well rewarded to be alienated." (p. 154)

So, while some people are demanding and will demand the

right to work at jobs, occupations, careers, vocations and missions, which they have been denied, others may now choose not to work for money, and certainly may choose a job over a career. Again we must remind ourselves that work can now be thought of as only one part of an individual's life, and for many not even a central part.

Earlier I said that I would like to explore with you the factors involved in change, and we have seen that resistance to change - both in the individual and his/her interpersonal and societyal supports - is a very important factor. Our habitual ways of behaving become very comfortable, and change - especially forced change - is seen as very threatening. The more basic the attitudes we are trying to change, the more threatening the change may be seen. We have seen also that one of the important factors in facilitating change is that the present system does not meet the psychological needs of large numbers of people.

As long as each individual thought it was a personal problem, she/he suffered alone and accomodated, fled into illness, took out his/her aggressions on spouse and children, expected more from the closest relationship-marriage-than could be met, looked to one's career for satisfaction (but did not receive human, emotional rewards there), and increasingly felt alienated, dissatisfied, and often worthless.

We have seen how at this time a combination of factors has coalesced to produce this time of great change. Now, along with accumulating knowledge and increasing affluence, there is increased awareness and ever larger numbers of people beginning to be a critical mass: a large enough concerned group to keep pressing for change and to become models of alternative ways of coping and living in less alienated, more liberated ways. It

would be very misleading to write this off as 'the woman's problem' and think that moving towards 'equal rights' meaning equal pay for equal work and measures like that would solve the problem. It is rather a human liberation problem, and demands qualitative not quantitative changes.

As the basic needs of human beings are met, so-called higher needs become prepotent and must be satisfied. So as survival becomes less a problem for human beings, growth needs become more important. They are no longer content to automatically pursue their jobs as their central concern; rather they begin to look for ways of increasing their consciousness, their awareness of those other parts of themselves which have for so long been neglected. Obviously retreat to the suburbs, escape through the abuse of drugs and alcohol, unlimited sex, spectator sports, and war have not been able to provide a lasting answer either. So we see that the old system does not work; and we cannot go back to any 'golden age'; we must instead cope in the present and plan for the future. Trial and error experimentation have been providing us with some alternatives. Intentional changes through supports provided by society are also called for, and those of us here are an influential part of our society and can facilitate the implementation of these needed supports. This will include informal support of those individuals and small groups that are already prepared for change and trying to live out alternatives, as well as formal support through legislation and other societal changes.

All of us of course are embedded in our cultures and our experiences, and it requires rather remarkable feats to find ways to gain perspective on issues which concern us today: work,

marriage, family; psychological factors in the choice of a career; alienation or liberation. There are, as Guillermo-Ramos tells us, parenthetical people: those who managed to escape the repressive socialization which most people do not escape. And so, some people can get beyond the limitations imposed by having grown up and lived with the myths of their society, and the rewards and punishments which help to maintain the status quo, and meet the needs and expectations of those in power.

Probably some of us here would identify with these parenthetical people as we examine the options available to women and men in relation to their careers. I know there are times when I feel that I have managed to stand aside, perhaps on the shoulders of some others who have some insights to offer, and I can catch a glimpse of how things might be, can be - and can share this glimpse with others, as I have tried to do today. There are other times when I am more discouraged, and need to look to others to sustain my faith and perspective. I hope we shall have shared some insights and experiences today which help us to sustain our faith in individual and social change, moving from alienation towards liberation.

It is on a note of optimism that I will come to the end of this talk in the next few minutes. I believe it is probably an inevitable development that societies will move towards more equalitarian based relationships among men and women, among people, with more equal opportunities for all and more personal freedom to select among more options. That will be true for the long run. Nevertheless, in the short run, it will require active efforts to effect attitude changes that lead to cooperation between

women and men, among people, to overcome the barriers that have for so long existed. This requires individual and social change since it is both a personal problem and a social issue. We must avoid simply taking on and extending the values of the dominant group, but rather must integrate the best parts of all: collaboration and competition, passivity and activity, emotions and rational thinking, independence and dependence, and so forth - so that individuals are no longer alienated within themselves by denying part s of themselves, and are not alienated from each other by polarizing their differences.

It will take the efforts of all of us to counteract centuries of role-related behaviors which have come to be accepted as 'natural' and to facilitate the liberation of individuals from the prescribed and proscribed options. We need to see the future as an opportunity to move from a survival orientation to one of abundance and prepare ourselves psychologically to welcome instead of fear such changes. We need to support diversity and flexibiliby; we need to see change as continuous and yet know that there can be stability without rigidity. For the individual and for society: the fewer the options, the more the restriction, the greater the alienation: people are shut off and shut out; the fewer the restrictions, the greater the options, the greater likelihood of liberation. The choice is ours.

REFERENCES

Bakan, D. The Duality of Human Existence, Rand-McNally, 1966.

Bernard, J. The Future of Marriage, Bantam, 1972.

Best, F. (ed) The Future of Work, Spectrum, 1973.

Chodorow, N. Being and Doing: a Cross-Cultural Examination of the Socialization of Males and Females, in Woman in a Sexist Society, (eds) V. Gornick and B. K. Moran, Basic Books, 1971.

Block, J. H. Conceptions of Sex Roles: Some Cross-Cultural and Longitudinal Perspectives, in Amer. Psychologist, June 1973, pp 512-526.

Davis, E.G. The First Sex, Penguin, 1972.

Dahlstrom, E. (ed) The Changing Roles of Men and Women, Beacon Press, 1971.

Fairweather, G. W. Social Change: The Challenge to Survival, General Learning Press, 1972, 43 pp.

Figes, E. Patriarchal Attitudes, Fawcett, 1970.

Firestone, S. The Dialectic of Sex, Bantam, 1970.

Fogarty, M.P., Rapoport, R., Rapoport, R.N. Sex, Career and Family: including an International Review of Women's Roles, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1971.

Freud, S. Some Psychological Consequences of the Anatomical Distinction Between the Sexes, in Schaeffer, D.L. Readings, pp 11-21.

Guerreiro-Ramos, A. The Parenthetical Man, in J. of Human Rel., Vol 19, #4, 4th qtr., 1971, pp 463-487.

Holter, H. Sex Roles and Social Change, in Safilios-Rothschild, pp. 331-343.

Kahn, H. and Wiener, A. The Future Meanings of Work: Some "Surprise-Free" Observations, in Best, F., pp 141-154.

Horner, M.S. Femininity and Successful Achievement: a Basic Inconsistency, in Bardwick, J.M. et al Feminine Personality and Conflict, Wadsworth, 1970.

Janeway, E. Man's World, Woman's Place: a Study in Social Mythology, Delta, 1971.

Levinson, D.J. et al. The Psychosexual Development of Men in Early Adulthood and the Mid-Life Transition, Yale, New Haven, mimeo, 22 pp.

Lewin, K. Field Theory in Social Science: selected theoretical papers. D. Cartwright (ed), N.Y., Harper, 1951.

Mead, M. Basic Regularities in Human Sex development, Male and Female, Ch. 7.

Parsons, T. The Social System, The Free Press, 1951.

Pleck, J. Male Sex Role and Personality: Toward a Research and Clinical Perspective, Harvard, 1972, 25 pp.

Rapoport, R. and Rapoport, R. N. The Dual Career Family: a Variant Pattern and Social Change, in Safilios-Rothschild, pp 216-244.

Rossi, A.S. Sex Equality: the Beginnings of Ideology, in Safilios-Rothschild, pp 344-353.

Roszak, B. and Roszak, T. (eds) Masculine/Feminine: readings in sexual mythology, Harper Colophon, 1969.

Rowe, M.P. Prospects and Patterns for Men and Women at Work: to be able both to love and to work, M.I.T., mimeo, 1973, 27 pp.

Safilios-Rothschild, C. Toward a Sociology of Women, Xerox Corp, 1972.

Schaeffer, D.L. Sex Differences in Personality: Readings, Brooks-Cole, 1971.

Seward, G. H. and Williamson, K.C. Sex Roles in Changing Society, Random House, 1970 (eds).

Toffler, A. E. Future Shock, Bantam, 1970.

Bachofen, J.J. Das Mutterrecht, 1861.

Briffault, R. The Mothers, 1927

Maslow, A. A Theory of Human Motivation: The Goals of Work, in Best, F. , pp 17-31.

Mills, C. W. The Sociological Imagination, Oxford Univ. Press, 1959.

Mitchell, A. Human Needs and the Changing Goals of Life and Work, in Best, F., pp 32-44.